

Court ruled that the diversity had academic value.

Now, I will argue that diversity of human experience may have academic value if it is a good and essential and positive experience that can be shared in a classroom. And it is good to interact with people of all ethnicities from all over the world, and the more of that experience you can get, the better your educational experience is.

But ethnicity does not have academic value. The Supreme Court ruled it did. They concurred with the University of Michigan and said, you reached that critical mass, you can be the sole determiner of that critical mass of diversity. Then, what we will do with this is, we are going to let you continue down this path, although you cannot have just a formula that spits something out of a spreadsheet, you have to have something that deals with each one of these individual students.

Well, okay, so it takes a little more attention to get the same result. But, in the end, the court suspended the 14th amendment, the equal protection clause that is established in our Constitution, suspended equal protection so we could have a critical mass of diversity as defined by the university, because that diversity, as indexed to skin color, had, in the minds of the court, academic value. And then the court, in its majority opinion, ruled that perhaps in 25 years, we can go back and we can revisit this subject matter of preferential treatment and affirmative action, revisit this subject matter and maybe, perhaps, this civilization, this culture, this American populace, will have moved forward into the new world far enough that we can then reestablish the 14th amendment equal protection clause, and maybe we do not need to have critical mass of diversity that we are going to declare to have academic value again.

□ 2115

Where does that come from, Justices? How do you believe that you can suspend the 14th amendment, for academic value on skin color and think we will be able to adhere back to our Constitution again? And if this Constitution does not mean what it says, if it can be suspended as simply myopic as this idea of critical mass of diversity, if that can happen, what meaning does the Constitution have whatsoever? Is it simply a document that happened to fall in our laps that the Founding Fathers stumbled across and stumbled into, and it happened to be a convenient thing that got us through the first 220 or so years of our existence?

Or is it something that means what it says? Is it something that has a provision for amendment for a reason that we are to adhere to the Constitution, the letter of the Constitution and the intent of the Constitution and not deviate from same unless we are willing to step forwards and amend it? That is what our Founding Fathers intended, but it is not what we see happening

here in the United States Supreme Court, and it is not what we see happening in the inferior courts that have been established by this Congress.

It is not the only example. And by the way, many of these examples are using foreign courts' opinions. Zimbabwe, Jamaica come to mind as places we can go to be further enlightened on how to better evaluate the original intent of the Constitution and the letter and the intent of our Federal law and our State laws and constitutions and legislation.

Foreign case law imposed upon United States of America? It is impossible to anticipate how the courts will rule given just U.S. court decisions let alone foreign, and some of these countries by the way do not let their people have freedom of speech, freedom of assembly or freedom of religion or they cannot go to the polls and elect a leader. So those decisions in the courts will not reflect the will and the character of the people. We need to redefine this line.

The Congress is also culpable; and I will hold them, in fact, more accountable because I think it is natural if you are a member of the executive branch of government, you are going to want to expand the authority of the executive branch. That is where you have got the most leverage, and that is where you have the most faith. And if you are a member of the legislative branch, as I am, I wanted to expand the power we have here because I think it reflects the voice of the people; and that voice of the people should be pre-eminent. And if you are a member of the judicial branch, I cannot image why human nature would not also apply there. And if you are a member of the judicial branch I would think you would want to then expand the power and leverage that you have in the judicial branch.

I do not blame them for that. But I will ask the courts, please rein it in because if you do not rein it in, sooner or later this Congress will. We do have the authority to do so; and if we exercise that will, that sets up a conflict between us. And I would rather see that be resolved in a peaceful way, a willing way with the best interests of the American people than I would want to have to impose that upon the courts. In fact, I am a little apprehensive that we cannot find the will in this Congress until it becomes a crisis.

Speaking of a crisis, the filibuster rules in the other body have set up another impending constitutional crisis. When we have a justice that is appointed to a Federal court and the Constitution requires that the President when he makes his nomination seek "the advice and consent of," and now I have to save the other body, that advice and consent clause that is in our Constitution is something that is very well established. We do not have any problem with the advice part. We get plenty of advice from those people over there and some of it is down right of-

fensive to the nominees. In fact, some of it is just plain out and out religious bias. It is character attacks. Declaring a nominee to be a Neanderthal is beyond the scope of what someone of that position ought to be in.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate your attention tonight and I will take this issue up at a later date.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). The Chair would remind Members not to make improper references to the Senate.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a family medical emergency.

Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a funeral in the district.

Mr. TANNER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 3:00 p.m. on account of a family emergency.

Mr. PENCE (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today until 5:00 p.m. on account of attending a funeral.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OTTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHAYS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, March 29.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows: